

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/091,637	Applicant(s) LINBERG, KURT R.	
	Examiner George R. Evanisko	Art Unit 3762	

All Participants:

(1) George R. Evanisko.

(2) Daniel Chapik.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 June 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
obvious double patenting rejection
Claims discussed:
21 and 23
Prior art documents discussed:
6442433
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: To submit a terminal disclaimer to overcome a double patenting rejection in view of 6442433. Although this case was a divisional from the patent, the claims have been amended extensively from the claims that were originally presented, and therefore an obvious double patenting rejection was made in view of the amdt of 3/30/06. In claim 21 and 23, the claim language was amended to overcome possible minor claim objections to clarify the language of the claims..